



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,234	09/10/2003	Guenter Mueller	DEAV2002/0065 US NP	3093
5487	7590	03/08/2006	EXAMINER	
ROSS J. OEHLER AVENTIS PHARMACEUTICALS INC. 1041 ROUTE 202-206 MAIL CODE: D303A BRIDGEWATER, NJ 08807			RAO, MANJUNATH N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	
DATE MAILED: 03/08/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/659,234	Applicant(s) MUELLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Manjunath N. Rao, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-44 are currently pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-6, 12-27, 37-40, 43-44, drawn to polynucleotides, vectors, host cells comprising said polynucleotides and method of making said polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
- II. Claims 7-11, 41-42, drawn to yeast cells lacking functional glucose transporters and *Erg4* protein, classified in class 435, subclass 243.
- III. Claim 28, drawn to a method for identifying a chemical compound which stimulates the activity of GLUT4 protein, classified in class 435, subclass 4.
- IV. Claim 29, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a compound of unknown structure that stimulates GLUT4 protein, classified in class 514, subclass 789.
- V. Claim 30, drawn to a method of treating Diabetes by administering the compound of unknown structure that stimulates GLUT4 protein, classified in class 514, subclass 789.
- VI. Claim 31, 33, 36 drawn to a method of identifying a compound of unknown structure that inhibits the protein encoded by FGY1 gene, classified in class 435, subclass 4/6.

Art Unit: 1652

- VII. Claim 32, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a compound of unknown structure that inhibits the protein encoded by FGY1 gene, classified in class 514, subclass 789.
- VIII. Claim 34, drawn to a method for identifying a compound which inhibits the protein encoded by ERG4 gene, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- IX. Claim 35, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a compound of unknown structure which inhibits Erg4 protein, classified in class 514, subclass 789.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II, IV, VII, IX are all products patentably distinct from each other. The polynucleotide of group I, the variant yeast cells of group II, the pharmaceutical compounds of groups IV, VII, IX each comprise amino acid sequences, nucleotide sequences and compounds of unknown structure, all of which are chemically unrelated, do not require each other for practice; have separate utilities, such as use of the group I polynucleotide in a hybridization reaction and are subject to separate manufacture and sale. The groups have acquired separate status in the art and separate fields of search.

Inventions III, V, VI, VIII are patentably distinct from each other. These inventions are all different methods. They are all unrelated as they comprise distinct steps, utilize different products and produce different results. The groups have acquired separate status in the art and separate fields of search as further evidenced by their separate classification.

Art Unit: 1652

The inventions I, II and inventions III, V, VI, VIII are unrelated. Inventions I and II are products, which are neither made nor used in the methods of groups III, V, VI, VIII. They are subject to separate manufacture and sale. The groups have acquired separate status in the art and separate fields of search as further evidenced by their separate classification.

Inventions IV and III, V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the compound in the pharmaceutical composition can be used to treat diabetes as opposed to its use in the method of Group III.

Inventions VII and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the compound in the pharmaceutical composition can be used to inhibit the growth of an yeast cell as opposed to its use in the method of Group VI.

Inventions IX and VIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product

Art Unit: 1652

as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the compound in the pharmaceutical composition can be used to inhibit the growth of a yeast cell as opposed to its use in the method of Group VIII.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1652

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Rejoinder of restricted inventions

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. **Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112.** Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. **Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined.** See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally,

Art Unit: 1652

in order to rejoin, in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Manjunath N. Rao, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0939. The Examiner can normally be reached on 7.00 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapura Achutamurthy can be reached on 571-272-0928. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.



Manjunath N. Rao, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1652

March 2, 2006